



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/899,472	07/03/2001	Laszlo Elteto	G&C 30074.30-US-II	3432

22462 7590 03/22/2004

GATES & COOPER LLP
HOWARD HUGHES CENTER
6701 CENTER DRIVE WEST, SUITE 1050
LOS ANGELES, CA 90045

EXAMINER

JACKSON, JENISE E

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

2131

DATE MAILED: 03/22/2004

8

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

h

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/899,472

Applicant(s)

ELTETO ET AL.

Examiner

Jenise E Jackson

Art Unit

2131

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on ____.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-17 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) ____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-17 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) ____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on ____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. ____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date ____.
- ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date ____.
- ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- ☐ Other: ____.

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

1. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

2. Claims 1-17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Rallis et al(6,425,084).

3. As per claims 1, 4, Rallis et al. discloses an input device for securing a token from an unauthorized user(see col. 1, lines 46-52), a user interface for accepting entry of a personal identifier from a user(see col. 1, lines 61-65); a processor, communicatively coupled to the user interface(see col. 2, lines 45-50); a token interface(see fig. 1A, sheet 1), including: a token interface emitter, for producing a signal having information including the personal identifier, the token interface emitter communicatively coupled to the processor and further communicatively coupled to a token sensor when the token is physically coupled with the token interface(see fig. 6A, sheet 11, col. 5, lines 44-48, 51-57); and a shield, substantially opaque to the signal, for substantially confining reception of the signal to the token sensor, Rallis et al. inherently discloses this, because Rallis discloses a user aligns the IR key device with the IR port, and transmits a message that includes the key device and serial number, and the encryption key(see col. 5, lines 51-57). The Examiner asserts that when the signal is transmitted it contains a shield

Art Unit: 2131

to insure no unauthorized interception of the signal that contains the user specific information(PIN, serial number, encryption key).

4. As per claim 2, Rallis et al. discloses wherein the token interface emitter is communicatively decoupled from the token sensor when the token is not physically coupled with the token interface(see col. 3, lines 18-24).

5. As per claim 3, Rallis et al. discloses wherein the token interface includes a USB port(14)(see fig. 1A, sheet 1).

6. As per claim 5, Rallis discloses wherein the token interface further includes, a token interface sensor configured to received the signal produced by token emitter when the token is physically coupled with the token interface(see col. 5, lines 51-57).

7. As per claim 6, Rallis inherently discloses wherein the token emitter emits a second signal including information describing information describing the intensity of the signal, because Rallis discloses an IR signal. The Examiner asserts that when a user has a sensor that is an IR signal, and then the signal transmits the intensity, because the sensor senses when the user is in a certain range(see col. 5, lines 51-57, col. 6, lines 7-10) .

8. As per claim 8, Rallis discloses securing a token having a USB-compliant interface(14) from unauthorized use(see fig. 1A, sheet 1), accepting the token in an input device having a token interface(see fig. 1A, sheet 1); accepting a user-entered personal identifier in the input device(see col. 2, lines 62-65); and transmitting the user-entered personal identifier to the token via a communication path distinct from the USB-compliant interface(see col. 5, lines 51-57).

9. As per claim 9, Rallis et al. discloses wherein the step of transmitting the user entered personal identifier to the token via a communication path independent from the USB-compliant

Art Unit: 2131

interface(see col. 5, lines 51-57); includes generating a first signal, inherently disclosed in Rallis, because Rallis discloses a IR device, and receiver. The Examiner asserts that an IR device transmits signals, and Rallis discloses having information including the user-entered personal identifier(see col. 5, lines 58-61); and emitting the generated signal in the token interface for reception by a token sensor(see col. 5, lines 58-61, col. 6, lines 7-13).

10. As per claim 10, Rallis discloses the step of receiving the generated first signal in a token sensor(see col. 1, lines 60-62).

11. As per claim 11, Rallis discloses accepting the token in a input device having a token interface including a USB compliant port(14)(see fig. 1A, sheet 1) includes, shielding the signal to confine reception of the signal to the sensor, Rallis et al. inherently discloses this, because Rallis discloses a user aligns the IR key device with the IR port, and transmits a message that includes the key device and serial number, and the encryption key(see col. 5, lines 51-57). The Examiner asserts that when the signal is transmitted it contains a shield to insure no unauthorized interception of the signal that contains the user specific information(PIN, serial number, encryption key).

12. As per claim 12, Rallis discloses the method includes the step of determining if the token is accepted in the device; and the user-entered personal identifier is transmitted to the token via a communication path independent from the USB compliant interface only if the token is determined to be accepted by the input device(see col. 1, lines 61-64, col. 2, lines 59-65).

13. As per claim 13, Rallis inherently discloses the step of determining if the token is accepted in the input device includes the step of sensing a connect signal, because Rallis

Art Unit: 2131

discloses an IR key device that must receive an IR pulse(i.e. connect signal)(see col. 6, lines 7-10).

14. As per claim 14, Rallis discloses the step of determining if the token has been accepted by the input device includes receiving a second signal produced by a token emitter when the token is accepted by the token interface, because Rallis discloses that an IR key device transmits a PIN to the notebook computer. The Examiner asserts that this signal is accepted if the PIN is correct(see col. 1, lines 61-64), col. 2, lines 59-65).

15. As per claim 15, Rallis discloses the step of determining if the token has been accepted by the input device includes receiving a second signal produced by a token emitter after the token sensor receives a third signal in the token interface, because if the user's pin is incorrect, the notebook shuts down(see col. 2, lines 3-10). The Examiner asserts that the third signal is the user's pin that is incorrect.

16. As per claims 7, 16, Rallis discloses receiving a second signal produced by a token emitter(see col. 1, lines 61-64, col. 2, lines 59-65), the second signal including information describing the intensity of the first signal; and controlling the intensity of the first signal; and controlling the intensity of the first signal according to the information describing the intensity of the first signal received from the second signal. Rallis inherently discloses the intensity of the signals, because The Examiner asserts that when a user has a sensor that is an IR signal, and then the signal transmits the intensity, because the sensor senses when the user is in a certain range(see col. 5, lines 51-57, col. 6, lines 7-10), and Rallis also discloses that messages are transmitted(see col. 5, lines 54-61, col. 6, lines 7-12) .

Art Unit: 2131

17. As per claim 17, Rallis discloses disabling transmission of the user-entered personal identifier until detection of the acceptance of the token to the USB port(see col. 2, line 67, col. 3, lines 1-3, 18-24, fig. 1A, sheet 1).

Response to Amendment

18. As per Applicant's response to office action dated 10/6/03 paper number 6, the Examiner has responded to Applicant's remarks dated 1/6/04 paper number 7.

19. First, Applicant states that the Rallis reference 6,425,084, does not disclose an input device for securing a token from an unauthorized user. The Examiner disagrees with the Applicant. Although, Rallis discloses preventing an unauthorized user to use a computer. Rallis also discloses that the key device(20) is used in conjunction with the computer in order to validate the user to perform operations(see col. 2, lines 45-67).

20. Second, the Rallis reference discloses that the user must enter the pin in order to be validated(see col. 1, lines 61-65, col. 2, lines 59-67). Therefore, Rallis does disclose an input device for securing a token from an unauthorized user. The Applicant is urged to show where in the Rallis reference(6,425,084) shows the user inputting the pin using the laptop computer. The Examiner asserts that Rallis does not disclose inputting the pin using a laptop computer. Rallis discloses that command messages are transmitted to and from the laptop to the key device(20), the messages contains a serial number, and encryption key and a pin. Therefore, because the Rallis reference discloses that the key device(20) is connected to the computer and messages are sent to the computer and these messages includes the pin along with other information, than

Art Unit: 2131

Rallis discloses that the pin is entered in the key device not the keyboard(see col. 1, lines 59-64, col. 2, lines 58-67).

21. Third, the Applicant states that the Rallis reference does not disclose an emitter producing a signal having the Pin entered by the user. The Examiner disagrees. Rallis discloses that the system can be used using an IR port(see col. 2, lines 45-52). Rallis discloses that messages are transmitted to and from the key device to computer and the pin is included in the message(see col. 2, lines 58-66).

22. Fourth, the Applicant states that Rallis does not disclose a shield. The Examiner disagrees with the Applicant, because Rallis discloses an encryption key that must have a corresponding decryption key in order to validate(see col. 6, lines 63-68).

24. Fifth, as per claim 2, Applicant states that Rallis does not disclose the token interface emitter is communicatively decoupled from the token sensor when the token is not physically coupled to the interface. The Examiner disagrees Rallis discloses that the user must align the IR emitter to the port and press and switch in order for information to be transmitted(see col. 5, lines 44-54).

25. As per claim 3, Applicant states that Rallis does not disclose a token interface sensor configured to receive the signal produced by a token emitter when the token is physically coupled with the token interface. The Examiner disagrees with the Applicant. Rallis discloses that the IR transmitter is aligned with the port in order to produce signal and send messages(see col. 5, lines 44-57).

26. As per claim 6, Rallis does disclose the intensity of the signal, key device sends commands low nibble and high nibble(see col. 4, lines 51-57).

Art Unit: 2131

27. As per claim 7, processor controls the intensity is inherent in Rallis, because Rallis waits for the command from the processor(see col. 4, liens 51-57).

28. As per claim 8, the pin issue has already been addressed(see above).

29. As per claim 15, the Examiner disagrees the third signal is the entered pin, and Rallis discloses and a token emitter(see above).

30. As per claim 17, Rallis does disclose transmitting a pin(see above). Rallis does disclose disabling the transmission of the user-entered Pin until detection of the token to the port, because if the key device is not detected the computer is powered down, and thus the messages of the pin transmitted cannot be transmitted.

FINAL ACTION

31. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Art Unit: 2131

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Jenise E Jackson whose telephone number is (703) 306-0426. The examiner can normally be reached on M-Th (6:00 a.m. - 3:30 p.m.) alternate Friday's.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Ayaz Sheikh can be reached on (703) 305-9648. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are (703) 305-0040 for regular communications and (703) 308-6306 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-3900.



March 19, 2004



AYAZ SHEIKH
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100